

bill will help protect children from pedophiles who stalk children on the Internet. It will also crack down on child pornography on the Internet.

I wish we could go further and eliminate children's access to pornography through the Internet, especially in schools and public libraries. Unfortunately, we have not yet been able to come up with more protective laws that pass a constitutional test. We must find a way. Too many people who promote pornography in this country hide behind the first amendment.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules heard stirring testimony from Members who support this bill. There is strong sentiment in the House for tougher sentences for people who use the Internet to prey on children. Regretfully, this is a restrictive rule. It permits only 10 floor amendments. I do note, though, that the Committee on Rules did make in order all germane Democratic amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules. A completely open rule would permit more full debate on this important bill. However, under the circumstances, it is important for the House to move forward in the process and take up the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN).

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the rule for today's consideration of the Child Protection and Sexual Predator Punishment Act. With the passage of this act, we will send a strong message to sexual predators and pedophiles all across this Nation: Make no mistake, sex crimes against children will not be tolerated.

This rule makes in order several important amendments that will further strengthen an already strong bill, ensuring that we leave no doubt of Congress' desire to put a stop to Internet sex crimes. This important legislation, introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and myself, is for mothers and dads throughout this country who are doing everything they can to keep their children safe and innocent, but may not be aware of the pedophiles who are cruising the Internet.

In an era where the boundaries of our communities are increasingly irrelevant, pedophiles are using the anonymity of the Internet to pose as minors and befriend vulnerable children who are unknowingly lured into very dangerous situations. That is why the McCollum-Dunn bill is so critical to families across America. This legislation helps law enforcement crack down on those who enter the safety of our homes to prey on our unsuspecting children. By creating new punishment for cyber predators, we will give our communities the tools they need to beat back those who use the Internet to satisfy their deviant behavior.

I ask my colleagues to help stop cyber predators in their tracks. Sup-

port this rule and support the McCollum-Dunn bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to speak on this important issue. I am strongly opposing the restrictive rule imposed up on us by the Rules Committee. This bill is a crucial step in the fight to protect our children from crime and violence, yet the rule under which this bill is made is far too restrictive and limits us from doing as much as we can to keep our children safe.

Crime on the Internet is an especially invasive and terrifying crime. Our children can be terrorized while they are seemingly safe inside our homes, in our living rooms, and in front of our family computers. We must increase penalties for those enticing or coercing any person under the age of 18 through the Internet to engage in sexual activity.

This Congress must send a message that this type of criminal activity will not be tolerated by our criminal justice system. As chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I believe our children are our future and must be nurtured, protected and guided. How can we protect them? By making sure that those people who are out to harm them and exploit them are restricted from their access to our children.

Under current law, the Federal Government has the burden of proving that a pedophile "persuaded, induced, enticed or coerced" a child to engage in a sexual act. However, this new legislation, H.R. 3494 would create a new federal offense to use the phones, mail or Internet to contact some one for the purpose of committing rape, child sex abuse, child prostitution or statutory rape.

It would also create a separate new federal offense for using the mail or Internet for knowingly transferring obscene material to a minor. I introduced an additional amendment to this legislation which would further protect our children from the types of predators who may be currently lurking behind our family computer screens. However, due to the restrictive rule, this amendment which could strengthen this legislation and further protect our children from Internet violence, will not make it to the floor today.

This amendment would have directed that the Federal Bureau of Investigation conduct a study of computer-based technologies and other approaches that could help to limit the availability to children of pornographic images through electronic media including the Internet and on-line services.

What could be more important to all of us than protecting our future and our children? Any amendment which seeks to keep our children safe from sexual predators and child abusers is for the benefit of all of our communities.

My colleague, Representative SLAUGHTER has introduced a similar amendment, a good amendment to protect our children by authorizing the National Institute of Justice to conduct a study of persistent sexual predators and report to Congress on their results.

I am happy to see that my colleagues have offered legislation which has been made in order, yet, the restrictive rule under which they have been offered will prevent many good plans to protect our children from ever reaching the floor! H.R. 3494, and additional amendments to this legislation would be a start to effectively preventing a predator from initiating a harmful relationship with a child for

illegal sexual activity, and to subjecting children to damaging pornographic material that our children can currently access.

In December of 1996, the FBI announced that it had executed search warrants in 20 cities as part of an ongoing nation-wide investigation into the use of computer online services and the Internet to lure minors into illicit sexual relationships.

We have all heard far too many horror stories involving child pornography and sexual abuse on the Internet. In May, in Illinois, a nine year old began getting strange phone calls at night. After her parents searched the Internet, they discovered that someone had posted Internet messages saying that their daughter was sexually active and wanted to have sex with other men. The messages included their home telephone number and said the child could be reached 24 hours a day. Current law does not prevent children from being exposed to sexually explicit material on the net, but hopefully this law will allow us to prosecute those who seek to commit such damaging and dangerous acts against children.

We must and should act directly to protect our young people from the scourge of child predators seeking to harm them through Internet communication, and we must act now!

I hope that you, my colleagues will support this legislation and oppose the restrictive rule under which we are required to observe, while we strive to support our nation's families and children by protecting them from pornography and predators on the Internet.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROPOSING AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION TO LIMIT CAMPAIGN SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The unfinished business is the question de novo on the passage of the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 119, on which further proceedings were postponed on Wednesday, June 10, 1998.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 29, nays 345,

answered "present" 51, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

# YEAS—29

Barrett (WI)	Harman	Minge
Bereuter	Hinchev	Moran (VA)
DeFazio	Holden	Obey
Dingell	Kennedy (MA)	Porter
Doyle	Kennedy (RI)	Poshard
Duncan	LaFalce	Sandlin
Engel	Leach	Smith, Adam
Ford	Lipinski	Stupak
Gillmor	Luther	Vento
Green	McHugh	

# NAYS—345

Ackerman	Dicks	Kilpatrick
Aderholt	Dixon	Kim
Allen	Doggett	Kind (WI)
Andrews	Dooley	King (NY)
Archer	Doolittle	Kingston
Armey	Dreier	Klecza
Bachus	Dunn	Klink
Baesler	Edwards	Klug
Baker	Ehlers	Knollenberg
Baldacci	Ehrlich	Kolbe
Ballenger	Emerson	LaHood
Barcia	English	Lampson
Barr	Ensign	Lantos
Barrett (NE)	Evans	Largent
Bartlett	Everett	Latham
Barton	Ewing	LaTourette
Bass	Fawell	Lazio
Bateman	Fazio	Lee
Bentsen	Filner	Lewis (CA)
Berry	Foley	Lewis (KY)
Bilbray	Forbes	Linder
Billirakis	Fossella	Livingston
Bishop	Fowler	LoBiondo
Bliley	Fox	Lofgren
Blumenauer	Franks (NJ)	Lucas
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	Manton
Boehlert	Gallegly	Manzullo
Boehner	Ganske	Markey
Bonilla	Gejdenson	Martinez
Bono	Gekas	Mascara
Boswell	Gibbons	Matsui
Boucher	Gilcrest	McCarthy (NY)
Brady (TX)	Gilman	McCollum
Brown (CA)	Goode	McCrery
Brown (FL)	Goodlatte	McDade
Bryant	Goodling	McDermott
Bunning	Goss	McHale
Burr	Graham	McInnis
Burton	Granger	McIntosh
Buyer	Greenwood	McIntyre
Callahan	Gutknecht	McKeon
Calvert	Hall (OH)	McKinney
Camp	Hall (TX)	McNulty
Campbell	Hamilton	Meek (FL)
Canady	Hansen	Meeks (NY)
Cannon	Hastert	Metcalf
Capps	Hastings (FL)	Mica
Carson	Hastings (WA)	Millender-
Castle	Hayworth	McDonald
Chabot	Hefley	Miller (FL)
Chambliss	Hefner	Mink
Chenoweth	Herger	Mollohan
Christensen	Hill	Moran (KS)
Clay	Hilleary	Morella
Clayton	Hilliard	Murtha
Clement	Hinojosa	Myrick
Clyburn	Hobson	Nethercutt
Coble	Hoekstra	Neumann
Coburn	Hooley	Ney
Collins	Horn	Northup
Combest	Hostettler	Norwood
Condit	Houghton	Nussle
Conyers	Hulshof	Oberstar
Cook	Hunter	Olver
Cooksey	Hutchinson	Ortiz
Costello	Hyde	Owens
Cox	Inglis	Oxley
Crane	Istook	Packard
Crapo	Jackson (IL)	Pappas
Cubin	Jefferson	Parker
Cummings	Jenkins	Pascrell
Cunningham	John	Pastor
Danner	Johnson (CT)	Paul
Davis (FL)	Johnson (WI)	Paxon
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E.B.	Payne
Davis (VA)	Johnson, Sam	Pease
Deal	Jones	Pelosi
DeGette	Kasich	Peterson (MN)
DeLay	Kelly	Peterson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	Kennelly	Petri
Dickey	Kildee	Pickering

Pickett	Schaffer, Bob	Tauzin
Pitts	Scott	Taylor (MS)
Pombo	Sensenbrenner	Taylor (NC)
Portman	Serrano	Thomas
Price (NC)	Sessions	Thompson
Pryce (OH)	Shadegg	Thornberry
Quinn	Shaw	Thune
Radanovich	Shays	Tiahrt
Rahall	Sherman	Torres
Ramstad	Shimkus	Towns
Rangel	Shuster	Trafigant
Redmond	Sisisky	Turner
Regula	Skaggs	Upton
Reyes	Skeen	Velazquez
Riggs	Skelton	Visclosky
Riley	Smith (MI)	Walsh
Rivers	Smith (NJ)	Wamp
Rodriguez	Smith (OR)	Waters
Roemer	Smith (TX)	Watkins
Rogan	Smith, Linda	Watt (NC)
Rogers	Snowbarger	Watts (OK)
Rohrabacher	Snyder	Weldon (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Solomon	Weldon (PA)
Roukema	Souder	Weller
Roybal-Allard	Spence	Weygand
Royce	Spratt	White
Rush	Stark	Whitfield
Ryun	Stearns	Wicker
Sabo	Stenholm	Wolf
Salmon	Stokes	Wynn
Sanders	Strickland	Yates
Sanford	Stump	Young (AK)
Saxton	Sununu	Young (FL)
Scarborough	Talent	
Schaefer, Dan	Tanner	

# ANSWERED "PRESENT"—51

Abercrombie	Gordon	Nadler
Becerra	Gutierrez	Neal
Blagojevich	Hoyer	Pallone
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Borski	(TX)	Rothman
Brady (PA)	Kanjorski	Sanchez
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Sawyer
Cardin	Kucinich	Slaughter
Coyne	Levin	Stabenow
Delahunt	Lowe	Tauscher
DeLauro	Maloney (CT)	Thurman
Deutsch	Maloney (NY)	Tierney
Eshoo	McCarthy (MO)	Waxman
Fattah	McGovern	Wexler
Frank (MA)	Meehan	Wise
Frost	Menendez	Woolsey
Furse	Miller (CA)	
Gephardt	Moakley	

# NOT VOTING—8

Berman	Etheridge	Lewis (GA)
Boyd	Farr	Schumer
Cramer	Gonzalez	

# □ 1117

Messrs. MANZULLO, SKAGGS, BURTON of Indiana, STEARNS, RUSH, PAXON, and McCOLLUM changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. HARMAN and Messrs. FORD, McCOLLUM, LIPINSKI, and POSHARD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Ms. WOOLSEY, and Messrs. WISE, FATTAH, GUTIERREZ, WEXLER, BLAGOJEVICH, BRADY of Pennsylvania, DELAHUNT, LEVIN, WAXMAN, COYNE, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. GORDON changed their vote from "nay" to "present."

Mr. GREEN and Mr. SANDLIN changed their vote from "present" to "yea."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# □ 1119

## SALES INCENTIVE COMPENSATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Pursuant to House Resolution 461 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2888.

# □ 1120

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2888) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt from the minimum wage recordkeeping and overtime compensation requirement certain specialized employees, with Mr. WICKER, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on the legislative day of Wednesday, June 10, 1998, a request for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 2 by the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) had been postponed.

Pursuant to the order of the House of that day, no further debate or amendments to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are in order.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OWENS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

## Amendment Offered by Mr. OWENS:

Page 6, line 9, strike the period, quotation marks, and the period following and insert a semicolon and insert after line 9 the following:

except that an employer may not require an employee who is exempt from overtime payment under this paragraph to work any hours in excess of 40 in any workweek or 8 in any day unless the employee gives the employee's consent, voluntarily and not as a condition of employment, to perform such work."

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 246, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]

## AYES—181

Abercrombie	Bentsen	Brady (PA)
Ackerman	Berry	Brown (CA)
Allen	Bishop	Brown (FL)
Baesler	Blagojevich	Brown (OH)
Baldacci	Blumenauer	Capps
Barcia	Bonior	Cardin
Barrett (WI)	Borski	Carson
Becerra	Boucher	Clay